

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/575,342	Applicant(s) RAPAKKO ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan A. Vu	Art Unit 2193

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) _____
 (2) Geza Ziegler. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 May 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1,7,14,15,21 and 28.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative was approached through more than one telephonic contacts (from 5/17 to 5/25) thereby the Examiner attempted to progressively communicate a proposed common scenario to impart to all the independent claims. According to which scenario, it was expressed that the claims should recite the storing of the 2 modules of the UI software prior to any starting, starting the basic module that does its specific setting, then using this setting to detect the coupling of the expansion card so to load the previously stored UI module by the started basic module, and utilizing the UI module to operate the expansion card being coupled to the device. The proposed changes were agreed mutually and effectuated to all the identified claims in order to put the claims in condition..